



MINUTES

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING

Wednesday, May 28, 2025

Approved by the Executive Committee on June 21, 2025.

TABLE OF CONTENTS
Executive Committee Meeting
Wednesday, May 28, 2025

CALL TO ORDER.....	2
VALUE STATEMENT.....	2
ROLL CALL/INTRODUCTIONS.....	2
REVIEW OF MEETING AGENDA.....	2
FINANCIAL INVESTMENT OF SY2026-27 SOCIETY THEME.....	2-5
UPCOMING MEETINGS.....	5
ADJOURNMENT.....	5

PRINCIPAL APPROVED MOTIONS

Executive Committee Meeting

Wednesday, May 28, 2025

No. - Pg.	Motion
1 - 4	\$50,000 be spent to develop the game proof of concept for the 2026-27 Society Theme.



MINUTES
EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING

Wednesday, May 28, 2025

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Dennis Knight, President
Bill McQuade, President-Elect
Sarah Maston, Treasurer
Devin Abellon, Vice President
Wade Conlan, Vice President
Ken Fulk, Vice President
Chandra Sekhar, Vice President
Jeff Littleton, Secretary

GUESTS PRESENT:

Ashish Rakheja
Trent Hunt
Andres Sepulveda
Bassel Anbari
Blake Ellis
Bryan Holcomb
Buzz Wright
Charles Bertuch
Carrie Brown
Cheng Wee Leong
Corey Metzger
Dan Nall
Dave Yashar
Doug Cochrane

Heather Schopplein
John Constantinide
Jonathan Smith
Julia Timberman
Maggie Moninski
Mike Pouchak
Ching Loon Ong
Pankaj Dharkar
Pat Marks
Rob Craddock
Scott Peach
Steve Kujak

STAFF PRESENT:

Candace Denton, Sr. Manager - Board Services
Chandrias Jolly, Manager - Board Services
Vanita Gupta, Director – Marketing
Rhannon Masterson – Interim Director – Member Services
Mark Owen, Director – Publications and Education
Kirstin Pilot, Director - Development
Craig Wright, Director of Finance

CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 8:04 am.

VALUE STATEMENT

Mr. Knight read the value statement and advised that the full code of ethics, core values and diversity statements were available online.

ROLL CALL/INTRODUCTIONS

Roll call was conducted; members, guests, and staff were in attendance as noted above.

REVIEW OF MEETING AGENDA

Mr. Knight reviewed the meeting agenda. There were no changes or additions.

FINANCIAL INVESTMENT OF SY2026-27 SOCIETY THEME

Mr. Littleton and Ms. Maston reviewed the gamification proposal for Society Year 2026-27. It was reported that the Society Theme would build on the 2024-25 Society Theme of workforce development. The proposed game would encourage young people to join the industry as well as serve as a possible training tool.

The proposed tool would be an interactive game, rolled out in July 2026. The goal would be for it to be an innovative training simulation focused on HVAC systems, optimization, and decarbonization strategies. Players would investigate different decarbonization strategies while keeping the building operational.

The monetary component of the game would be in credits so they could be used anywhere in the world.

The team from Metropolitan University in Toronto working on the project would be building on existing research, making the proposal very cost effective.

The Development Team was actively courting donors but a full proof of concept would be needed to secure funding.

The full cost of the game was estimated to be \$182,000.

Is ExCom comfortable committing the currently budgeted \$50,000 to develop the proof of concept? What happens if full funding is not secured? It was reported that Ms. Pilot was confident that the Foundation would provide \$50,000 in matching funds that could be allocated to this effort. Even with Foundation matching funds additional funding would be needed to fully fund the initiative.

It was reported that there was a lot of interest and excitement around the proposal.

It was reported that Metropolitan University was still working in good faith as there was not a contract currently in place.

Mr. Littleton reported that it is common practice to spend money on a Society Theme in advance of the Society Year to prep things so they can be launched in the actual Society Year. The ask is slightly different in this instance because additional funding is required and has not been secured yet.

He reported that this matter was time sensitive. Does ExCom support spending \$50,000 on the proof of concept for a project that has additional funding requirements down the road?

The floor was opened for discussion and there was significant discussion of the proposal. A summary of that discussion is below:

Gamification teamed with machine learning is becoming a big deal. Would machine learning or AI be included? Would Society retain intellectual property and copyrights?

Mr. Littleton reported that Society would retain copyright of the game. If approved, the game would require ongoing maintenance. With regards to AI, it was suggested that the game regenerate various scenarios so that users are continuously challenged. This is a big initiative and Society would be agreeing to spend \$50,000 without knowing where the balance would come from.

Would this platform be able to be used moving forward as a new way of distributing knowledge or is it specifically for this game and this Society Theme? Is this a new direction that Pub and Ed will be taking or is this a one off? Suggested that the full ask was really over \$200,000; that is a large price tag for one effort.

Mr. Littleton reported that the proposal was pretty specific to this Society Theme. But, with the foundation in place, getting to a different game would be a shorter path. Software and games are expensive to create and maintain.

What is the second year in the budget?

Ms. Maston clarified that \$50,000 is the budget to create the demo; the amount listed for the second year budget represents the full development of the game.

What is the expectation in terms of access? Would the game be free to members? Would it be subscription based?

Mr. Littleton reported that those details had not been ironed out yet. He stated that it would likely be used as a recruitment tool and would not be fee based.

Colleagues have used games and active participation to achieve a learning outcome; makes the learning process more engaging and enjoyable. Suggested that a challenge could be developed for users to reach an end goal or objective.

Suggested that a tournament could be organized where student branches compete against one another.

Would it be possible to identify one partner to help defray some of the costs?

Ms. Maston reported that Development was looking for partners. The goal is to include standards and other publications in the game. There would be various levels and modules and perhaps even some for working professionals as well as students. She suggested that there may also be licensing opportunities. The goal is for the game to be funded or fund itself into perpetuity.

This proposal has generated huge excitement. There is also a risk element that needs further investigation. Suggested that leadership approve the \$50,000 and that further investigation be carried out. Could be sitting on something with much larger potential.

Suggested that leadership not be shortsighted – this could just be the jumping off point if the proposal has potential, especially if it can be tied to machine learning. Could be leveraged down the road to attract students into the industry.

Clips of different modes were shown on screen. Ms. Maston explained the intent behind each of the modes.

What is the objective of the game? Would it be able to be played multiple times? Will this help players get better at their job?

Ms. Maston reported that there would be different objectives and game parameters; progress would be saved, or a new game could be started each time; levels could be cleared and the level of complexity would increase.

Spoke in favor of the proposal. Huge proponent of ASHRAE developing practical tools. The game would provide an opportunity for players to change roles and allow users to better understand different roles and perspectives. Agree that the idea needs to be fully flushed out to ensure it is viable. Are we under contract? Are there 'outs' built into the contract?

Mr. Littleton reported that a contract is currently under review but has not been signed. He reported that the contract would include an out clause once the proof of concept is finished.

Spoke in favor of the proposal. Will there be more than one building that users can navigate? Could there be different building typologies like residential, office, healthcare, etc.?

Ms. Maston reported that currently there would be one building prototype; trying to keep it simple at this point to create the proof of concept. The concepts are limitless; it is just a matter of what the group wants to focus on.

The proof of concept is the full amount that is budgeted for the Society Theme each year. Is there anything else that Ms. Maston wants to do beyond this? Suggested that there seemed to be two steps to the proposal – the proof of concept and then the larger investment that would need to be accompanied by a business plan.

Ms. Maston responded that she hoped to build relationships and engage with different groups in the industry; would piggyback on initiatives that the CEED is already working on. Don't anticipate an additional funding need. Agreed that there are multiple steps to the proposal.

Ms. Maston reported that the AI MTG would also be engaged.

Mr. Abellon moved and Mr. Sekhar seconded that

1. \$50,000 be spent to develop the game proof of concept for the 2026-27 Society Theme.

MOTION PASSED (5:0:1, CNV). Ms. Maston abstained.

Mr. Knight thanked the committee for the great discussion and expressed his excitement at the proposal.

Ms. Maston thanked ExCom for their consideration. She asked that not too much detail be shared with other members so the Marketing team can prepare the usual Society Theme reveal.

UPCOMING MEETINGS

Mr. Knight reviewed the meeting dates and times for the Annual Conference in Phoenix.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 8:54 am without objection.

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Jeff Littleton". The script is cursive and fluid.

Jeff H. Littleton, Secretary